



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

120 Fed. 893. Thus it seems plain that the instant case is limited in its effect to removing from the application of the general rule those holding companies organized primarily to evade the law.

**CORPORATIONS—ISSUE OF STOCK FOR PATENTS UNDER MICHIGAN STATUTES.**—The corporation was capitalized at \$200,000 of which \$100,000 was subscribed and \$20,200 paid in cash and property. Also a contract was entered into by which \$70,000 in stock was issued to A, B, & C in return for their *promise* to assign the American patent, when it should be issued, to an air compressor for automobiles. Later, when it was found impossible to obtain an American patent, the directors of the corporation voted to accept the foreign patents already held by A, B, & C in lieu of the American patent. *Held*, that this contract was in fraud of the other stockholders and that the stock issued to A, B, & C should be delivered up to be canceled, and they barred from sharing in distribution of corporate assets on dissolution. *In re American Air Compressor Co.*, (Mich. 1916), 160 N. W. 388.

Clause 6 of §2 of the General Incorporation Laws of Michigan (How. ANN. STAT. §9533) provides that 10% of the authorized capital stock of a corporation must be paid in cash or property, and in the latter case there must be affidavits by at least three of the incorporators averring actual transfer to the corporation, and swearing to the actual value. Here it seems that \$70,000 in stock was to be issued on the mere *possibility* of a patent, and it is difficult to conceive how a patent right in futuro could have been transferred to the corporation or how it could have satisfied the further requirement of the statute that it be transferable by the corporation and subject to levy and execution by the corporate creditors. The matter was not brought up in the case and was not mentioned in the opinion, as it was not necessary to decide the case. This is regrettable. In many corporations a large amount of stock is issued for patent rights. The Michigan statute is in terms most rigid. The evaluation of a patent right, which must be sworn to, is a difficult matter at best, and it is of the greatest importance to a large number of honest and well-intentioned citizens that the courts define just what is required of incorporators who wish to issue shares for patent rights which are necessarily more or less conjectural in value.

**EVIDENCE—EXPERT TESTIMONY NOT ADMISSIBLE ON QUESTION OF SIGNATURE BY MARK.**—A will was signed by a feeble man, 92 years of age, who made a mark as a substitute for his signature. Three witnesses testified that the testator had made the mark; two testifying that the testator had made the mark unassisted, while the third testified that he had aided the testator's feeble hand in making the mark. Plaintiffs contesting the will offered expert testimony to show that this was not the mark of the testator. *Held*, that the court properly excluded the testimony, as a mark is not "writing" within the meaning of New York Laws 1880, Ch. 36, and Laws 1888, Ch. 555, which permit the comparison of writing by experts. *In re Caffrey's Will*, (1916) 161 N. Y. Supp. 277.

The court decided this case upon the authority of *In re Hopkins*, 172 N. Y. 360, 65 N. E. 173, 65 L. R. A. 95, 92 Am. St. Rep. 746, where it was ex-